

IV. REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for extending the courtesy of a telephone interview.

3. During the interview the Examiner stated that the specification can be amended to conform to the drawings instead of providing new drawings. This has been done.

4. The abstract has been amended as requested and section headings have been inserted into the specification.

6. During the telephone interview the Examiner stated that the 1½ line spacing used in the present application is acceptable.

7. The title has been amended as suggested.

10. Claim 4 now positively recites first and second parts. Claim 12 has been similarly amended.

11. The claims have been extensively amended to conform to U.S. practice. It is therefore submitted that all claims now conform to 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

13. Gleeson does, in fact, discuss a protocol, but there is a notable issue he does not teach (see, for example, Background of the Invention and Summary of the Invention). Gleeson actually reduces (optimises) size of the packets and, in fact, even states that specialised protocols exist and could be used, but this causes the drawback that the

protocol is often dependent on the exact network configuration. The use of specialised protocols often means that end-to-end reliable communication services are not allowable. See column 3, lines 13 to 24. Gleeson does not teach protocol conversions but reduction in the number of packets (Summary of the Invention).

Claims 1, 9 and 17 all recite "performing one or more protocol conversions". Since this is not in Gleeson, the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-17 under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn.

Also, since this feature is not suggested by Gleeson, these claims are unobvious over it.

Further, since this feature is not in Bhagusat, combining it with Gleeson does not result in the present invention. Thus the rejection of claims 4 and 12 under 35 USC 103 on this reference combination should be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler

Henry I. Steckler

Reg. No. 24,139

Oct 28, 2004

Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 10/28/04

Signature: Doris W. Reiman
Person Making Deposit